	1	
1	EVIN V. RYAN (CASBN 118321) nited States Attorney	
3	EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722) Chief, Criminal Division	
4	ROBERT DAVID REES (CASBN 229441) Assistant United States Attorney	
5 6 7	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7210 Fax: (415) 436-7234	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. 3 -05-70548 EMC
13	Plaintiff,) [PROPOSED] ORDER AND) STIPULATION FOR CONTINUANCE
14	V.) FROM SEPTEMBER 2, 2005 TO SEPTEMBER 29, 2005 AND EXCLUDING
15	ROSSIE HAWKINS,	TIME FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §
16	Defendant.) 3161(h)(8)(A)) AND WAIVING TIME LIMITS UNDER RULE 5.1
17		
18	With the agreement of the parties, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court enters this	
19	order scheduling an arraignment or preliminary hearing date of September 29, 2005 at 9:30A.M.	
20	before the duty magistrate judge, and documenting the defendant's waiver of the preliminary hearing	
21	date under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 and the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial	
22	Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b), from September 2, 2005, to September 29, 2005. The parties agree, and	
23	the Court finds and holds, as follows:	
24	The defendant has been released or	n his own recognizance.
25	2. The defendant agrees to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §	
26	3161(h)(8)(B)(iv) to provide continuity of counsel and reasonable time necessary for effective	
27	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.	
28	3. The defendant waives the time limit	ts of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 for

1 preliminary hearing. 2 4. Counsel for the defense believes that postponing the preliminary hearing is in his client's best 3 interest, and that it is not in his client's interest for the United States to indict the case during the normal 4 20-day timeline established in Rule 5.1. 5 5. The Court finds that, taking into account the public interest in the prompt disposition of 6 criminal cases, these grounds are good cause for extending the time limits for a preliminary hearing 7 under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1. Given these circumstances, the Court finds that the 8 ends of justice served by excluding the period from September 2, 2005 to September 29, 2005, 9 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. § 3161(h)(8)(A). 10 6. Accordingly, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court (1) sets a preliminary hearing 11 date before the duty magistrate judge on September 29, 2005, at 9:30A.M., and (2) orders that the 12 period from September 2, 2005 to September 29, 2005 be excluded from the time period for 13 preliminary hearings under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 and from Speedy Trial Act 14 calculations under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B)(iv). 15 16 IT IS SO STIPULATED: 17 /S/ Daniel Blank DANIEL BLANK DATED: <u>9/1/05</u> 18 Attorney for Defendant 19 20 /S/ Robert D. Rees 21 DATED: <u>9/1/05</u> ROBERT DAVID REES 22 Assistant United States Attorney 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 25 26 DATED: September 2, 2005 ed States Magistrate Judge 27

28